

REMARKS

Claims 19-32 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 23 and 31 and amends claims 24 and 32 for conformity therewith. In addition, Applicant adds new claims 33-35, which are clearly supported throughout the specification.

I. Preliminary Matters

As preliminary matters, the Examiner acknowledged Applicant's claim to foreign priority and indicated receipt of the certified copy of the priority document. The Examiner returned the initialed forms PTO/SB/08 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements filed on December 6, 2005, February 24, 2006, November 13, 2006, April 2, 2007, and July 23, 2007. The Examiner also indicated acceptance of the drawing figures filed on December 6, 2005.

II. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner objected to the specification. The Examiner objected to claims 23 and 31 for minor informalities. The Examiner also rejected claims 19, 20, 22-26, 28, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and claims 21, 27, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 19-32 are also provisionally rejected under non-statutory double patenting rejection.

III. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention as being non descriptive. Applicant has amended the title. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection in view of the amendment to the title.

IV. Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 23 and 31 as being in an improper dependent form. Specifically, the Examiner contends that claims 23 and 31 are repetitive of the features set forth in their respective independent claims (*see* page 2 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection in view of cancellation of these claims.

V. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 19, 20, 22-26, 28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,564,263 to Bergman (hereinafter “Bergman”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Independent claims 1 and 25 *inter alia* and in some variation recite: the asset comprises one or more audio data and one or more photo data and is displayed by use of the asset corresponding to the reference information. The Examiner contends that Bergman disclose each and every feature of claims 1 and 25. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Bergman fails to anticipate an asset as set forth in these independent claims.

That is, Bergman discloses representing temporal relationship between multimedia objects (IOS) which include aligning their start, end, and occurrence and representing spatial relationships (col. 15, line 23 to col. 16, line 25). Although Bergman discloses aggregation of multimedia objects, Bergman fails to disclose or suggest a multimedia object having audio data and photo data. Specifically, Bergman discloses multiple objects such as video, images, audio, text and so on (col. 6, lines 15 to col. 67). In other words, Bergman is no different from the conventional techniques in that it discloses a complex system having various conventional

multimedia objects and various description frameworks which define interrelationship between these objects.

Therefore, “the asset comprises one or more audio data and one or more photo data and is displayed by use of the asset corresponding to the reference information,” as set forth in claims 19 and 25. For at least these exemplary reasons, claims 19 and 25 are patentably distinguishable from Bergman. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection. Claims 20, 22-24, 26, 28, and 30-32 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 19 or 25.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergman and claims 21 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergman, and further in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter “APA”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejections at least in view of the following exemplary comments.

Claims 21, 27, and 29 depend on claim 25. It was already demonstrated that Bergman does not meet all the requirements of independent claim 25. The APA does not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Bergman. Together, the combined teachings of the APA and Bergman would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to have achieved the subject matter of claim 25. Since claims 21, 27, and 29 depend on claim 25, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

VI. Double Patenting

Claims 19-32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonsatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over a) claims 6-10 and 12-18 of copending Application No. 11/415,096, b) over claims 16-20 and 24-30 of copending Application No. 10/948,316, c) over claims 28, 30-34, and 36-41 of copending Application No. 10/949,474, and d) over claims

18-22 and 25-31 of copending Application No. 10/949,253. Since these copending applications were not yet prosecuted, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner hold these rejections in abeyance.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Nataliya Dvorson/
Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 3, 2008